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# What are three conclusions that we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?

From the data we see that crowdfunding campaigns built around theatre(plays), music(rock) and film and videos(documentaries) are not only more successful than other campaigns, they also fail more and are more common than other campaigns. From an Australian standpoint technology takes a precedence over music.

Overall, campaigns are more likely than not to be considered successful crowdfunding campaigns. This is the case across each of the individual countries represented in the data. This is particularly evident in 2017 where successful campaigns outshone the failed ones. I wonder if household savings and disposable income were maybe stronger in 2017 or perhaps the crowdfunding platforms themselves were gathering traction and momentum since 2010.

Campaigns launched midyear are also correlated to being more successful.

# What are some limitations

1. The data describes pledges to reach an arbitrary goal value as successful, but the goal might not be a true reflection of whether or not the actual product or service will be successful and cover costs into the future. It refers merely to the campaign of raising funds.
2. It doesn’t take into account the quality of the pitch and how convincing or entertaining the crowdfunding pitch was. How does this relate to the actual success of the underlying product or service? Backers really want to pump money into a potentially success product/offering to achieve dividends or returns on their investment.
3. Of course, without the initial funding, the produce or offering might not be able to take off even though it might be a very good idea/product/service. But this does not mean that it cannot be successful without crowdfunding backing it. There are many other ways to raise funds.
4. Some of the categories appear to overlap such as journalism, publishing and technology. Podcasts could fit all three categories.
5. Are cancelled pledges not also perhaps failed ones?
6. We’ve assumed that the pledges are investments but the reality is that on these platforms the money pledged could be a loan or it could be a donation as well.

# What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that could be created and what value would they add?

* We could have looked at the length of time the campaign ran for on the platforms (from launch date to deadline). Looking more closely for correlations between the length of time and successful pledges might provide some insight into how popular the project is in that the longer it is on the platform for the more time they have to be able to collect pledges and vice versa. If it is still successful in a very short period of time then is this an indication of the project being very popular and thus successful. Or is the shorter timeframe an indication of the campaign runners being very confident that their project will be successful and thus would be something worth pledging/investing in? Longer timeframes may be an indication that their confidence level is not as high and do not believe in their project as much.
* We could have looked at the name of the campaign runners and their percentage of success historically assuming that some of them have campaigned more than once or are regular campaigners. A history of success might be a predictor of future successes.
* We could have honed in on the data around succefull campaigns more closely. Specifically those that raised more than 100% then look at the categories. We might have a situation where our charts currently show that plays have the most successes but what level of success is this? Which categories are the most successful? We were almost there when we worked out the percentage funded. We could have sorted this into value ranges based on goal as well.
* We could have looked at the average pledge amount and how this correlates to the successful campaigns and their categories. Do people pledge larger amounts for more successful campaigns or in certain categories or do they pledge smaller dollar values but have more backers. At the end of the day the more backers is an assumption of success. But maybe it was just 1 backer who wanted to be the sole investor by making a large outlier pledge.